REMARKS

Thorough examination of the application is sincerely appreciated.

Applicants wish to thank the examiner for withdrawing 1) the objection to the specification and 2) rejections under 35 USC 112 and 101.

According to the Final Office Action, a new oath/declaration was required because allegedly it was not properly signed. This requirement is respectfully traversed. The examiner's attention is directed to the USPTO Image File Wrapper and, in particular, an entry entitled "Oath or Declaration filed" on April 22, 2002. As can be readily observed from the IFW, it is submitted that the declaration properly signed by all inventors was filed with the USPTO on April 22, 2002. Therefore, the requirement for a new oath/declaration is not warranted and should be withdrawn.

Further according to the Final Office Action, claims 1 and 5 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Published Application US20010000962 (hereinafter "Rajan"). Further according to the Final Office Action, claims 6 and 10 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Rajan in view of US Patent 6,275,239 (hereinafter "Ezer") and further in view of the alleged applicants' admitted prior art. Still further according to the Final Office Action, claims 3, 4 and 8 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Rajan in view of Ezer, further in view of the alleged applicants' admitted prior art, and still further in view of the publication "Computer Graphics: Principles and Practice" (hereinafter "Foley").

In response, the rejections are respectfully traversed as lacking sufficient factual support and failing to establish a prima facie case of obviousness in accordance with the established cases and statutory law.

It is respectfully submitted that pursuant to 35 USC 102(e), a person shall be entitled to a patent unless:

> "(e) the invention was described in - (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for the purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language."

It is respectfully submitted that Rajan cannot claim the benefit of its PCT application because the PCT application was filed prior to November 29, 2000. Rajan also cannot claim the benefit of the provisional application because it expired prior to the entry into the US national stage. According to 35 USC 102(e), Rajan can only be applied as of its publication date, which is May 10, 2001. Since the present application claims foreign priority to the application filed with the European Patent Office on October 24, 2000, Rajan does not qualify as prior art. The examiner is invited to review MPEP, section 706.02(f) for additional clarification on 35 USC 102(e).

At least for the above reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections of claims 1 and 5 have been overcome and can no longer be sustained. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims.

With respect to the rejections of claims 3, 4, 6, 8 and 10, it is respectfully submitted that the examiner relies on Ezer for co-processor only and on Foley for "multiple processor process in parallel." Relevance of either Ezer or Foley is respectfully traversed, as the features from those references were merely extracted using Applicants' invention as a blueprint and completely disregarding applicability of Ezer and Foley as a whole. The examiner failed to provide any teaching, suggestion or motivation to combine the references. Such practice cannot possibly be

sanctioned by the USPTO.

In addition, Applicants do not concede that the subject matter disclosed on page 5, lines 15-18 of the instant application is prior art. No admission was made in the application, and the examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw his designation of that portion of the application as Applicants' admitted prior art.

Since Rajan was removed from the rejections of claims 3, 4, 6, 8 and 10, even if for the sake of argument, Ezer and Foley are applicable to the present invention, those references are deficient in rendering Applicants' claims unpatentable. Applicants submit that the reason for the rejection of claims 3, 4, 6, 8 and 10 has been overcome and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn and claims allowed. An early notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

An earnest effort has been made to be fully responsive to the Examiner's correspondence and advance the prosecution of this case. In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice thereof is earnestly solicited. However, if for any reason this application is not considered to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Please charge any additional fees associated with this application to Deposit Account No. 14-1270.

Respectfully submitted,

By___/Larry Liberchuk/____
Larry Liberchuk, Reg. No. 40,352
Senior IP Counsel
Philips Electronics N.A. Corporation
914-333-9602

December 6, 2006